DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 369 178 EA 025 802

AUTHOR Glanz, Jeffrey
TITLE History of Educational Supervision: Proposals and Prospects.
PUB DATE Mar 94
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (Chicago, IL, March 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; *Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; Public Schools; *School Supervision; *Supervisors; *Supervisory Methods

ABSTRACT

Public school supervision in the United States has been historically influenced by its roots in western Europe and unique characteristics of the American educational system. Much history of school supervision describes it as a series of disjointed and unrelated events. And supervision appears to simply reflect greater social and educational movements. No clear theme has emerged in the historical study of supervision. A review of research on supervision history reveals that little has been done in dissertations, books, and articles. While the interaction of broad social and intellectual movements has had a role in the history of supervision, supervisors were also active members. They supported business-like management concepts and directed resources to further their own professional interests. There have also been conflicts between the historical roots of supervision in bureaucracy and newer ideas of professionalism. The history of supervision is marked by seven models: inspection, efficiency, democratic, scientific, leadership, clinical, and changing concepts. Supervision was originally inspectional and later redefined as an efficient, authoritative, and managerial function. School-based management and peer coaching are attempts to use democratic ideals to overcome the bureaucratic history of supervision. Footnotes are included. (JPT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 369 178

History of Educational Supervision:

Proposals and Prospects

By

Jeffrey Glanz, Ed.D.

Assistant Professor

Department of Instruction, Curriculum, and Administration

Kean College of New Jersey

Paper Presentation before the

Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS)

Chicago, Illinois March 18, 1994

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Glanz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 025 802

OUTLINE OF CHAPTER

HISTORIES, ANTECEDENTS, AND LEGACIES:

CONSTRUCTING A HISTORY OF SCHOOL SUPERVISION

By

Jeffrey Glanz

Kean College of New Jersey

I Introduction (untitled)

II Review of research
- 1) Prominent dissertations
- 2) Published book on supervision
- 3) Other historical treatments

III Towards a theory of understanding the history of supervision
- 1) Applying the bureaucratic-professional model
- 2) Research on bureaucracy and professionalism

IV The emergence of bureaucracy
- 1) European antecedents and early developments
- 2) Expansion and transformation in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries
- 3) Supervision as inspection: model # 1
- 4) The bureaucratization of supervision

V The emergence of professionalism
- 1) Importance of schooling
- 2) Status of supervision
- 3) Supervision as social efficiency: model # 2
- 4) Teacher rating as a function of supervision
- 5) Democratic methods emerge: model # 3
- 6) The professional orientation
- 7) Scientific supervision: model # 4
- 8) The distinction between supervision and administration
- 9) The status of supervision: 1920-1940
- 10) Curriculum and supervision
- 11) The joint committee
- 12) The end of an era

VI The expansion of democratic methods in supervision
- 1) Changing conceptions in supervision
- 2) Supervision as leadership: model # 5
- 3) Clinical supervision: model # 6
- 4) 'Changing conceptions' model (# 7) of supervision: recent developments

VII Understanding the history of supervision

VIII Future research
- 1) Degrees of ahistoricism in supervision
- 2) Constructing a history
- 3) Relevant sources

History of Educational Supervision:

Proposals and Prospects

Presented at COPIS
March, 18, 1994
Jeffrey Glanz

This invited presentation will, in part, summarize my forthcoming chapter in the Handbook of Research on School Supervision. I have attached a tentative outline of the chapter on the topic "Histories, Antecedents, and Legacies." I welcome your reactions, comments, and suggestions. Feel free to contact me at home: 228 Martin Avenue New York, N.Y. 10314 (phone: 718-761-5778). Please note that my chapter has not undergone revisions. Therefore, my outline is tentative.

I will briefly outline my chapter by headings (refer to outline as a guide). I will then include an article I wrote, based on a portion of my chapter, that is currently under review by the Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. In this article I invite practitioners, researchers, and professors of supervision to attend to historical scholarship. The lack of attention to both supervision as a field of study and to historical inquiry is pointed out. I explicate the meaning and significance of the historical perspective as well as pose several questions as to what it means to think historically about supervision. Why supervision history has been marginalized is considered as well as recommendations and further avenues for continued scholarship. I again welcome your comments. Thank you.

Chapter summary:

I Introduction

> Of all the responsibilities of school operation, instructional supervision stands out as the one most discussed, yet least understood. In spite of the success that has been achieved, the administrative waterfront of American education is littered with the debris of supervisory ventures that failed to live out the storm, failed to reach the needs of classroom instruction. Some were stern and austere craft that were abandoned as unfit for the humanitarian purposes of modern supervision. Some were properly planned but neglected by their navigators. . . .
>
> Of all the responsibilities of school operation, supervision stands out as the one most in need of clarification. There is no greater challenge in the study of American education. . . .
>
> Harold Spears (1953)

Public school supervision in the United States has been shaped and influenced by a variety of historical forces. On the one hand, there are patterns and traditions of school supervision which have been brought over from Western Europe (Button, 1961). On the other, we find that the development of school supervision took on a unique character of its own. While it is true that the importance of transplanted European values and beliefs should be understood, American education, in general, and supervision, in particular, were formed and shaped by many factors that were uniquely American (Harris, 1890; Arrington, 1972).

The history of school supervision, complex and distinct, is clearly a history of the interaction of the broad social and intellectual movements within American society. Although several published textbooks have traced the development of school supervision (for example, Beach & Reinhartz, 1989; Wiles & Lovell, 1983; Eye, Netzer & Krey, 1971; Neagley & Evans, 1970; Lucio & McNeil, 1962; Swearingen, 1962; Cramer & Domian, 1960; Ayer, 1954; Burton & Brueckner, 1955), much of this history describes eras

or changes in supervision as a series of disjointed and unrelated events. As a result, developments in supervision appear to be loosely connected, having little, if any, relation to one another. Moreover, supervision seems to simply reflect social movements and educational developments occurring in society. While greater attention has in recent years been paid to the historical development of supervision (Pajak, 1993; Bolin & Panaritis, 1992; Glanz, 1991; Karier, 1982), there is yet lacking a single, definitive, coherent historical theme that adequately explains the development of theory and practice of supervision in the United States.

To be sure, the theory and practice of school supervision have been influenced by a plethora of social, philosophical, economic, and political forces. For instance, economic capitalism at the turn of the century influenced school supervisors to institute production-oriented theories of school administration wherein detailed and elaborate inspectional practices dominated supervisory practice (Bolin, 1987). Further, in the early twentieth century democratic values played a key role in American education and influenced espoused theories of school administration and supervision (Pajak, 1993). While these and many other irrefutable sociopolitical and educational connections have been advanced by historians (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992; Tanner & Tanner 1987), a coherent theory of educational history that explains why supervisory theory and practice have evolved to their present status has been elusive.

This chapter, then, will have a three-fold purpose: (1) to review relevant historical research on the evolution of public school supervision in the United States, (2) to present a theoretical model or construct which helps us begin to understand the historical developments of school

supervision in this country, and (3) to point out relevant and significant avenues for future research.

In this chapter, I will begin to detail relevant historical research on school supervision, noting significant contributions to our understanding of the function and conception of supervision. I will critically analyze some these works in terms of their contributions to our understanding of the development of supervision. I will point to areas in which we can begin to construct a more comprehensive and coherent history of school supervision. This will be followed by an attempt to develop such a theoretical construct in order to more completely clarify the complex and extensive developments which have occurred in the history of supervision. Trends and developments occurring in school supervision will then be placed in context in relation to the theoretical construct developed in this chapter. It will be demonstrated that the events affecting school supervision were not a string of unrelated events, but a series of developments that embodied a simple and coherent purpose. A discussion of future research efforts into the history of school supervision forms the conclusion of the chapter.

II Review of research

In this section, I review the relevant research that has been done on supervision history. I review prominent dissertations (e.g., Button, 1961), books (e.g., Glanz 1991), textbooks (e.g., Spears, 1935; Tanner & Tanner 1987), articles (e.g., Bolin and Panaritis (1992), papers (e.g., Blumberg, 1986), and other works. Unfortunately, this review is all too brief!

III Towards a theory of understanding the history of supervision

In this section I intend to introduce a theory of history that attempts to go beyond the assumption that supervision merely reflected movements occurring in society as a whole, and in education, in particular. The history of supervision is the history of the interaction of broad social and intellectual movements affecting all aspects of education. The field of supervision and supervisors as educators were certainly influenced by these societal developments. However, supervisors were also active participants in shaping their destiny. They were, for instance, exponents of business-like conceptions of management where supervisors acted like captains-of-industry in the corporate world, rather than victims of business pressures. Supervisors marshalled resources to further their own professional interests.

While the historical antecedents of supervision were rooted in bureaucracy, later efforts centered on developing professional status in schools. Throughout the twentieth century, theories or models of supervision emerged in response to reconcile inherent bureaucratic-professional conflicts of schooling. Understanding this construct enables us to understand the progression of various models of supervision.

I will explore how supervision moved through eras or changes by contrasting the development of seven (7) models of supervision: inspection, efficiency, democratic, scientific, leadership, clinical, and 'changing conceptions'.

How current efforts in supervision (i.e., school-based management, peer supervision, etc.) reflect efforts to professionalize teaching, extend democratic ideals in school supervision, and circumvent bureaucratic legacies will be discussed.

I briefly discuss the bureaucratic-professional model and present relevant research.

IV The emergence of bureaucracy

I discuss early developments in the history of supervision and explore the first model, 'supervision as inspection'. Professional supervision, as we know it today, essentially emerged as a vital administrative function in schools in the late nineteenth century. Influenced by bureaucracy, as was urban education as a whole, supervisory practice was characterized as inspectional, and later redefined as an efficient, authoritative, and managerial function.

V The emergence of professionalism

In this longest section of the chapter I discuss the evolution of three models of supervision. 'Efficient' supervision, 'democratic' supervision' and 'scientific' supervision emerged as attempts to remove the stigma associated with 'inspectional' supervision.

VI The expansion of democratic methods in supervision

Three other models are presented (supervision as 'leadership,' 'clinical' supervision,' and what I refer to as the 'changing conceptions' model.

VII Understanding the history of supervision

Essentially, various models or theories of supervision emerged as an attempt to reconcile bureaucratic-professional conflicts. Supervisors and those concerned with supervision wanted to disassociate themselves from

bureaucracy and the evolution of various models reflect an effort to extend democracy and professionalism in supervision. School-based management and peer coaching, for example, are efforts to extend democratic ideals in supervision and circumvent our bureaucratic legacy. In the chapter and in my presentation I will explain another, not unrelated, theme that influenced the history of supervision.

VIII Future research

I do not believe that we suffer any longer from ahistoricism. But I do think we have not attended to historical issues and certainly have not analyzed the historical context for our proposals, models, and theories. I conclude by offering recommendations and highlighting relevant sources and avenues for research.

An Invitation to Supervision History: A Research Agenda[1]

At present, supervision, as a field of study has little by way of history. . . . It is hoped that the interested reader will join in the provocative venture of exploring public school supervision, historically.[2]

The field of supervision has been a practical one[3], concerned more with administrative and supervisory strategies for school operation than with analysis and introspection. Consequently, the field of supervision has produced few histories since history is not considered a 'practical' art. Lamenting the ahistorical nature of the curriculum field, Doyle and Ponder nearly twenty years ago in an ASCD yearbook devoted to historical inquiry of curriculum, echoed these very same sentiments.[4] Extending an invitation to participate in "curriculum history," Davis, Jr., in the same yearbook, outlined specific sources and methods needed to undertake historical

---

1. AUTHOR'S NOTE: I would like to acknowledge the competent reviewers of this article whose insightful comments helped the author clarify and expand several critical ideas. Special thanks to, colleague and friend, Helen Hazi, Associate Professor of Education Administration at West Virginia University, for prompting an explication of what it means to be historical. Thanks to Tom Banit, colleague at Kean College, for his constructive criticisms. Finally, to O.L. Davis, Jr. for his encouragement, patience, and editorial mastery. Of course, any inaccuracies are the sole responsibility of this author.

2. Jeffrey Glanz, "Ahistoricism and School Supervision: Notes Toward a History," Educational Leadership (November 1977): 154.

3. For recent insights into supervisory "practice," see Arthur Blumberg, Frances S. Bolin and Thomas J. Sergiovanni and their articles published in the Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 5 (Spring 1990): 236-251.

4. Walter Doyle and Gerald A. Ponder, "Sources for Curriculum History," in Perspectives on Curriculum Development 1776-1976, ed. O. L. Davis, Jr. (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1976), p. 247.

analysis of curriculum.5 After the publication of the ASCD yearbook in 1976, historical studies in the curriculum field increased with much greater frequency than ever before.6 Although this interest in curriculum history has yielded only modest returns, the field of curriculum suffers much less from historical amnesia than does the field of supervision.7

This article is an attempt to accomplish for supervision what Doyle, Ponder, Davis, Kliebard, and others initiated for curriculum. Hopefully, historical research will proliferate so that our field can be more informed about its antecedents and legacies in order to more adequately plan for the future. This is an invitation for continued scholarship into the history of supervision.

Degrees of ahistoricism in supervision

The proliferation of works focusing on the history and historiography of American education has been marked and comprehensive. Since the early to mid-1970s, the history of American education has expanded to include a broad range of topics and issues. History as a legitimate mode of

---

5. O. L. Davis, Jr., "Epilogue: Invitation to Curriculum History," in Perspectives on Curriculum Development 1776-1976, ed. O. L. Davis, Jr. (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1976), pp. 257-259.
6. For a review of these studies see Herbert M. Kliebard, "Constructing a History of the American Curriculum," in Handbook of Research on Curriculum, ed. Philip W. Jackson (New York: Macmillan, 1992), pp. 157-184.
7. It should be noted that while interest in curriculum history has advanced, a serious problem continues to plague the curriculum field. Aside from a small band of thoughtful and reflective people interested in curriculum history, most others in the field of curriculum appear to have little or no regard for historical studies. Compared to supervision, the situation is not so bad, but the 'golden age' of curriculum history has yet to arrive. Thanks to one of the anonymous reviewers for highlighting this point.

inquiry is today unquestioned.8 Regrettably, however, supervision as a field of study and practice has escaped serious and ongoing investigation by educational historians.9 Despite the fact that administration,10 curriculum,11 teaching,12 teacher education,13 urban schooling,14 and even special education,15 for example, have received notable attention, school supervision remains largely unexamined and neglected.16

---

8. See, for example, Bernard Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society (New York: Vintage Books, 1960); Lawrence A. Cremin, The Wonderful World of Ellwood Patterson Cubberley: An Essay on the Historiography of American Education (New York: Teachers College Press, 1965); Douglas Sloan, "Historiography and the History of Education," Unpub. MS, 1971; Robert L. Church, "History of Education as a Field of Study," in Encyclopedia of Education IV, ed. L. C. Deighton (New York: Macmillan 1971); Wayne J. Urban, "Historiography," in The Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. H. C. Mitzel (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1982); Michael B. Katz, Reconstructing American Education (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1987).
9. See, for example, Jeffrey Glanz, "Beyond Bureaucracy: Notes on the Professionalization of Public School Supervision in the Early Twentieth Century" Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 5 (Winter 1990): 150-170.
10. See, for example, Roald F. Campbell, Thomas Fleming, L. Jackson Newell and John W. Bennion, A History of Thought And Practice in Educational Administration (New York: Teachers College Press, 1987); David Tyack and Elisabeth Hansot, Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820-1980 (New York: Basic Books, 1982).
11. See, for example, W. H. Schubert and A. L. Lopez-Schubert, Curriculum Books: The First Eighty Years (Lanham, MD: University Press of America); Herbert M. Kliebard, The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958 (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986); Craig Kridel, ed. Curriculum History (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1989); Daniel Tanner and Laurel N. Tanner, History of the School Curriculum (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1990); Philip W. Jackson, ed. Handbook of Research on Curriculum (New York Macmillan Publishing Company, 1991).
12. See, for example, Donald Warren, ed. American Teachers: Histories of a Profession at Work (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989).
13. See, for example, W. R. Houston, ed., Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1990).
14. See, for example, Carl F. Kaestle, The Evolution of an Urban School: New York City 1750-1850 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973); Joseph M. Cronin, The Control of Urban Schools (New York: The Free Press, 1973); Diane Ravitch, The Great School Wars (New York: The Free Press, 1974; David Tyack, The One Best System: A History of American Education (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974; Michael B. Katz, Reconstructing American Education (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1987)
15. See, for example, John G. Richardson and Tara L. Parker, "The Institutional Genesis of Special Education: The American Case," American

The problem is not new. Almost twenty years ago, ASCD itself lamented the lack of interest in supervision by stating that "a definitive history of educational supervision has not been published."17 In that same year, an ASCD yearbook devoted to historical analysis gave insufficient attention to supervision from a historical perspective.18 Attesting to this neglect of supervision as a field of study, Krajewski called "for putting the 'S' back into ASCD".19 Two years later, the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS) echoed this concern.20 Glanz argued that "supervision as a field of study has little by way of history."21

This article, although falling short of advocating a formal subspecialty in historical scholarship of supervision, certainly does explicitly maintain that historical investigation of supervision is warranted and be given greater

---

Journal of Education 101 (August 1993): 359-392; John G. Richardson, "Historical Expansion of Special Education," in The Political Construction of Education, ed. Bruce Fuller and Richard Rubinson (Wesport, Conn.: Praeger, 1992); Marvin Lazerson, "The Origins of Special Education," in Special Education Policies: Their History, Implementation, and Finance, ed. Jay G. Chambers and William T. Hartman (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983).

16. See, for example, Carl D. Glickman, Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Incorporated, 1985), p. xii. For a detailed review of historical work in supervision see the author's chapter, "Histories, Antecedents, and Legacies" in the forthcoming Handbook of Research on School Supervision to be edited by Gerald R. Firth and Edward Pajak.

17. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Curriculum Leaders: Improving Their Influence (Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1976).

18. O. L. Davis, Jr., ed., Perspectives on Curriculum Development, 1776-1976 (Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1976).

19. Robert J. Krajewski, "Putting the 'S' Back in ASCD," Educational Leadership 33 (February 1976): 376. Also see, for example, comments made by Fred Wilhelms, executive secretary of ASCD 1968-71: "For in all truth, the Association has seldom devoted a major proportion of its energies directly to supervision." Fred T. Wilhelms, "A Report to the Membership," ASCD, (January, 1970): 1.

20. Gerald R. Firth, "ASCD and Supervision: The Later Years," in ASCD in Retrospect, ed. William Van Til (Washington, D. C.: ASCD, 1986), p. 80.

21. Jeffrey Glanz, "Ahistoricism and School Supervision: Notes Towards a History," Educational Leadership 35 (November 1977): 148-54; Also, see Jeffrey Glanz, "Supervision: A Field Without a Past?" CSA Education Review II (Fall 1990): 55-61.

attention. I think it may be helpful before explicating why historical research in supervision has been marginalized and examining avenues for further historical inquiry, that a brief description of what is meant by history, what are the benefits of historical study, and what it means to think historically about supervision be explored.

The study of history is a struggle to understand the "unending dialogue between the present and the past."22 As such, the notion of "temporality" finds relevance in terms of understanding the "flow" of historical events. People as well as events cannot only be explained in terms of the present, but must be understood by a past and a future. The past, present, and future, according to Ernst Cassirer, form an "undifferentiated unity and an indiscriminate whole."23 Friedrich Kummel explains this notion of temporality as an historical process "in which the past never assumes a final shape nor the future ever shuts its doors. Their essential interdependence also means, however, that there can be no progress without a retreat into the past in search of a deeper foundation" (emphasis added).24

The experience of reflective consciousness through historical inquiry implies an awareness of the past and its interconnectedness to present conditions and future possibilities. History, then, can be understood as an attempt to study the events and ideas of the past that shape human experience over time in order to inform current practice as well as to make

---

22. E. H. Carr, What is History? (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1961), p. 8.
23. Ernst Cassirer, An Essay on Man: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture (New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1953), p. 219.
24. Friedrich Kummel, "Time as Succession and the Problem of Duration," in The Voices of Time, ed. J. T. Fraser (New York: George Braziller, 1966), p. 50.

more intelligent decisions for the future.25 History is more than simply recording all past experiences and events. Historians are interested in those aspects of the past that have historical significance. Since what may be historically significant for one may be irrelevant to another, it is essential that the reconstruction of the past be undertaken from different perspectives by different people. Moreover, significance is granted only when a sufficient amount of time has lapsed in order to ensure that contemporary demands alone do not dictate what is considered historically important.26 Seen in this way, history is the retelling and interpretation of significant events of the past.27

The value of history is its concreteness, its placing of events, people, and theories within context.28 History supplies the context with which to view current proposals. More fundamentally, understanding how our field has come to take the shape it has is a compelling reason to undertake historical inquiry. Historical exploration can also help us understand the antecedents of current innovations or theories. Thus, having a history will deepen and strengthen our identity as a field of scholarship and provide us with a collective consciousness.

It is not enough for theorists of supervision to develop proposals and formulate new models of supervision by systematically explaining their underlying assumptions. It is also not enough that practitioners carry out

---

25. Leonard M. Marsak, The Nature of Historical Inquiry (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970).
26. See, for example, O. L. Davis, Jr., "Memory, Our Educational Practice, and History," The Educational Forum XX (19XX): 375-379.
27. Lester D. Stephens, Probing the Past: A Guide to the Study and Teaching of History (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974).
28. See, for example, I. F. Goodson, "History, Context, and Qualitative Methods in the Study of the Curriculum," in Strategies of Educational Research: Qualitative Methods, ed. R. G. Burgess (Lewes: Falmer Press, 1985).

supervisory strategies in order to solve immediate problems. Instead, those concerned with supervision must continually reflect on their basis for doing what they do. Critical historical analysis will have per se a two-fold effect on our field: (1) leaders, developers, and researchers will look to the past for precedent; and (2) those who write and theorize about supervision will view their efforts as embedded or situated in a set of historical conditions. To look for precedent, to draw upon historical responses to contemporary-like problems, to view current proposals and models as connected to prior efforts and dilemmas is to acknowledge our historicity.

To be historical, then, means to be concerned with questions such as:

(1) How are our prevailing practices and advocated theories connected to the past?

(2) How have significant ideas, events, and people influenced or informed current practice?

(3) What are the social, economic, philosophical, and political forces that have shaped our experience/theories/field?

(4) Once we understand our legacies, can we formulate models of supervision that address the exigencies of the present by building on lessons of the past?

(5) What else can we learn from history that might help develop the field of supervision?29

The emergence of a history of supervision not only demands an understanding of how the field came to be as it is, but also how current practices and theories of supervision are outgrowths of past developments.

---

29. See, for example, W. Reid, "Curriculum Theory and Curriculum Change: What Can We Learn from History?" Journal of Curriculum Studies 18 (1986): 159-166.

To think historically is to break away from taken-for-granted notions that reinforce reliance on immediacy as the sole measure for theory and practice in supervision. To think historically means much more than presenting a superficial overview in the first chapter of a book or a subsection of an article.30 To underscore the import of history as a perspective that can provide useful information, one must continually deliberate by posing key historical questions. I think Daniel Tanner and Laurel Tanner's textbook on supervision titled Supervision in Education: Problems and Practices, for example, is an excellent example of the kind of historicity our field should strive for. The authors go beyond providing an overview of the evolution of the field in the first chapter, which they do by the way very competently. As the chapters unfold, historical perspective is reflected and taken seriously.31

An illustration of the lack of attention paid to supervision history is, for instance, the manner in which writers in the field address the changing conceptions of the status and function of supervision. Thomas J.

---

30. Three rather good and noteworthy historical overviews that are presented as single chapters are, for example, Harold Spears, Improving the Supervision of Instruction (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953); J. M. Gwynn, Theory and Practice of Supervision (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1961); and Robert D. Krey and Peter J. Burke, A Design for Instructional Supervision (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1989).

31. Daniel Tanner and Laurel Tanner, Supervision in Education: Problems and Practices (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1987). While Tanner and Tanner's historical approach is pervasive and quite evident, guiding principles or criteria, nonetheless, need to be established and referred to in determining whether or not an author has engaged in historical scholarship. O. L. Davis, Jr. and Gerald Ponder have, in fact, developed some interesting and, I think, accurate and helpful formulations for use in evaluating curriculum history research that can be readily applied to work in supervision. The guidelines are: authority, interpretation, significance, context, representativeness, perspective, and style. I think utilizing these guidelines for supervision history inquiry will be instructive. See, O. L. Davis, Jr., et al, Looking at History (Washington, D.C.: People for the American Way, 1986), pp. 14-15.

Sergiovanni and Robert J. Starratt, in their recently revised textbook on supervision retitled Supervision: A Redefinition, assert that numerous changes and understandings about schooling, teaching, and leadership, among other factors, necessitate a "redefinition" of supervisory practice and theory. "This redefinition includes the disconnection of supervision from hierarchical roles and a focus on community as the primary metaphor for schooling." By "community" the authors, of this comprehensive, up-to-date, and widely acknowledged text on supervision, denote the fact that responsibility for supervision has widened to include not only supervisors, but teachers, mentors, consultants, and other school and district-based personnel. Still, Sergiovanni and Starratt maintain that "The supervisor's role remains important but is understood differently."32

There seems to be a tenaciously held conviction that ***supervisors*** continue to be necessary, even essential, in an educational world that is now populated by teachers and other educators specially trained to perform supervision.33 Teacher decision-making and democratic school governance is replacing bureaucratic mandates and administrative fiat.34 The field of supervision over the past fifty years or so has not readily acknowledged, and has even resisted, the distinction advanced in the 1930's that supervision as a ***function*** is not, nor should be, necessarily located in supervision as ***person***. The merger between the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction (DSDI) and the Society for Curriculum Study to eventually form the Association for Supervision and Curriculum

---

32. Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Robert J. Starratt, Supervision: A Redefinition (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1993).
33. See, for example, Marvin Willerman, Sharon L. McNeely, and Elaine Cooper Koffman, Teachers Helping Teachers: Peer Observation and Assistance (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1991).
34. Susan Moore Johnson, Teachers at Work: Achieving Success in Our Schools (New York: Basic Books, 1990).

Development (ASCD) is indicative of a "shift from status to function."35 While conceptions in supervision appear to have changed, as reflected, for instance, in title changes of the various editions in Sergiovanni and Starratt's book, educators concerned with school supervision have insisted on maintaining archaic conceptions regarding the role and function of supervision. That supervision should be a democratic, cooperative function performed by those leaders engaged in improving instruction has been long recognized and advocated. Thus, without reference to past proposals and an explication of how current propositions evolved, we fall prey to reinventing the wheel again and again.

An example of how unresolved dilemmas have continued to plague our field involves the critical issue known as the "inservice education" and "evaluation" conflict. A number of individuals have addressed this inherent role conflict, experienced by those involved in supervising instruction.36 Tanner and Tanner, in their noteworthy and scholarly textbook on school supervision, acknowledge this dilemma. Supervisors are challenged daily, they say, to assist teachers "in solving classroom problems." As such, they are inclined to interact with teachers personally and professionally. To be effective leaders, supervisors must maintain friendly, helpful relationships with teachers. However, when evaluation must be done, these collegial relationships may be jeopardized. Tanner and Tanner state: "No doubt,

---

35. O. L. Davis, Jr. "Symbol of a Shift from Status to Function: Formation of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development," Educational Leadership 35 (May 1978).
36. See, for example, Helen M. Hazi, "The Teacher Evaluation-Supervision Dilemma: A Case of Entanglements and Irreconcilable Differences," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 9 (Winter 1994): 195-216; Wendy Poole, "Removing the 'Super' From Supervision" Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 9 (Spring 1994): forthcoming; Jeffrey Glanz, "Dilemmas of Assistant Principal's in Their Supervisory Role," Journal of School Leadership 4(2) (March 1994): forthcoming.

many teachers are afraid to ask for help from supervisors because they believe that by exposing a problem with their teaching, they are inviting a low evaluation of their work . . ."37 This "improvement" versus "evaluation" dilemma, although pervasive, has been only marginally addressed in the literature of supervision and remains unresolved.38 Continued historical analysis can shed light on how different generations sought to resolve this dilemma. Hence, more creative and effective solutions may be proffered.

So, have we constructed a history of supervision? Are we historically conscious of our traditions and legacies? To the extent that some scholars have seen the relevance of history and have, in fact, taken an historical perspective in their writings39 we have certainly made some progress. Notwithstanding these fruitful explorations into the past and general acceptance of historical inquiry as a viable enterprise, much of the field of supervision has given limited attention to our history.40 A perusal of

---

37. Daniel Tanner and Laurel Tanner, Supervision in Education: Problems and Practices (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1987), p. 106.
38. Although proposals to resolve this dilemma have been proffered, debate still continues. See, for example, Robert J. Starratt, "After Supervision," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 8 (Fall 1992): 77-86; Arthur Blumberg, "A Response to Starratt's 'A Modest Proposal: Abolish Supervision'," Wingspan: A Pedamorphosis Communique 8 (July 1992): 22-24
39. See, for example, Robert H. Anderson and Karolyn J. Snyder, Clinical Supervision: Coaching for Higher Performance (Lancaster Pennsylvania: Technomic Publishing Co., 1993); Robert D. Krey and Peter J. Burke, A Design for Instructional Supervision (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1989); Daniel Tanner and Laurel Tanner, Supervision in Education: Problems and Practices (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1987); Arthur Blumberg and William Greenfield, The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1986).
40. See, for example, G. C. Kyte, How to Supervise: A Guide to Educational Principles and Progressive Practices of Supervision (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1930); Muriel Crosby, Supervision as Co-operative Action (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957); Ben M. Harris, Supervisory Behavior in Education (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963); Kimball Wiles and John T. Lovell, Supervision for Better Schools (Englewood

textbooks, journal articles, conference presentations clearly demonstrates this. More fundamentally, however, much of the history that has been written describes eras or changes in supervision as a series of disjointed and unrelated events. Consequently, developments in supervision appear to be loosely connected, having little, if any, relation to one another. While, for instance, Edward Pajak, Frances Bolin, Jeffrey Glanz, Robert Anderson, Noreen Garman, Arthur Blumberg, and Clarence Karier have attended to important aspects of history, a coherent and definitive history of supervision remains illusive.41

This author's concern, then, about the treatment of supervision history as an identified area of scholarship rests on two problems. First, while some practitioners and theorists are certainly ahistorical, many others have simply given limited attention to history as a viable area of scholarship. Second, the attention that has been given to supervision history has not only been abysmally sporadic, but neither effective nor persuasive. A perusal of many textbooks on supervision, occasional dissertations, and

---

Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975); Peter F. Oliva, Supervision for Today's Schools (New York: Longman, 1989).

41. Edward Pajak, "Change and Continuity in Supervision and Leadership," in Challenges and Achievements of American Education: 1993 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, ed. Gordon Cawelti (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 1993): 158-186; Frances S. Bolin and Philip Panaritis, "Searching for a Common Purpose: A Perspective on the History of Supervision" in Supervision in Transition: 1992 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development ed. Carl D. Glickman (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 1992): 30-43; Jeffrey Glanz, "Beyond Bureaucracy: Notes on the Professionalization of Public School Supervision in the Early 20th Century" Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 5(2): 150-170; Robert H. Anderson, "The Genesis of Clinical Supervision," in Learning About Teaching Through Clinical Supervision ed. W. John Smyth (London: Croom Helm, 1986); Noreen B. Garman, "Reflection, The Heart of Clinical Supervision: A Modern Rationale for Professional Practice," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 2 (Fall 1986): 1-24; Arthur Blumberg, "Where We Came From: Notes on Supervision in the 1840s," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 1 (1985): 56-65; Clarence Karier, "Supervision in Historic Perspective," in Supervision of Teaching ed. Thomas J. Sergiovanni (Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1982): 2-17.

selected journal articles demonstrates the generalized and simplistic treatment of history. Many authors have taken, for example, a chronological approach to examining the evolution of supervision history.42 Besides the fact that periodization can be arbitrary and monotonous, it is more usually inaccurate. Furthermore, the occasional attention to history has not had a significant impact on practice. Our field characteristically remains overly pragmatic and highly prescriptive. A climate of urgency prevails in which 'to do' is more valued than 'to know'. It is not so much that our field is ahistorical, as much as the fact that our use of history lacks specificity, nuance, and power.43

An explanation for this paucity of historical research in supervision can be attributed to several fundamental reasons. First and foremost is the fact that varying degrees of ahistoricism characterizes our field. Ahistoricism in supervision due to lack of knowledge of intellectual traditions and inherited modes of behavior characterized the field for many years. While this sort of ahistoricism may be "a thing of the past," practitioners and theorists continue to marginalize the importance of historical inquiry. Many educators assert that historical inquiry has little, if any, impact on day-to-day practice. Supervisors, be they assistant principals, principals, district office personnel, curriculum workers, mentors, classroom

---

42. See, for example, Henry W. Button, "A history of Supervision in the Public Schools, 1870-1950" (Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University, 1961); Alfred A. Arrington, "An Historical Analysis of the Development of Supervision in the Public Schools of the United States," (doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, 1972); William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962); Don M. Beach and Judy Reinhartz, Supervision: Focus on Instruction (New York: Harper & Row, 1989).

43. A similar charge was posited in regards to the curriculum field. See, J. Stephen Hazlett, "Conceptions of Curriculum History," Curriculum Inquiry 9(2) (1979): 129-135. Thanks to O. L. Davis, Jr. for the lead and J. Stephen Hazlett for the fax.

cooperating teachers, peer consultants or educational evaluators, are burdened by demanding and challenging responsibilities of managing schools and providing instructional services to teachers. As such, they are very much practice-oriented.44 A perusal of major publications that supervisors subscribe to, such as Educational Leadership, NASSP Bulletin, NAESP Bulletin, and the Journal of School Leadership, indicate that most articles are highly prescriptive, only a few deal with theoretical postulates and even less with historical analyses.

Moreover, the nonreflective stance taken by the field of supervision is compounded by a rather different form of ahistoricism. Not only do practitioners question the usefulness of understanding past events, but they tend to uncritically accept current ideas about supervisory practice that have their origins in the past. Reflective of this notion of presentism, for instance, is the persistence of bureaucratic authority in supervision. Some practitioners fail to acknowledge other important sources of authority, such as "the professional and moral."45 For these practitioners, the primary sources of authority for supervision will rarely change from bureaucratic to professional and moral without, at least, understanding the origins of bureaucratic governance and how supervisors have historically been

---

44. See, for example, Debra J. Anderson, Robert L. Major, and Richard R. Mitchell, Teacher Supervision That Works (New York: Praeger, 1992); James Cangelosi, Evaluating Classroom Instruction (New York: Longman, 1991); Carl D. Glickman, Supervision of Instruction; Larry W. Hughes & Gerald C. Ubben, The Elementary Principal's Handbook (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1989); Keith A. Acheson and Meredith D. Gall, Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers (New York: Longman, 1987); Edward F. DeRoche, An Administrator's Guide for Evaluating Programs and Personnel (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1987); Sir Robert James Marks, Emery Stoops, and Joyce Stoops-King, Handbook of Educational Supervision (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Incorporated, 1985).
45. Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Moral Authority and the Regeneration of Supervision," in Supervision in Transition ed. Carl D. Glickman, (Washington, D. C.: ASCD Yearbook, 1992).

influenced by bureaucratic mandates. Ahistoricism precludes an understanding of the ways in which meanings have been sedimented in current practice. As Kliebard notes, albeit in relation to curriculum, "Under these circumstances, the present almost inevitably intrudes on our understanding of the past, and the past becomes little more than a rationale for exhortations in behalf of urgent changes in the present."46

Ahistoricism is only partially responsible for lack of interest in supervision. After all, the field of curriculum suffered not too long ago from historical amnesia as well.47 Why, then, is the problem so pronounced in supervision? Another explanation may focus on the fact that there has been a lack of clarity in even defining supervision.48 Robert Alfonso and Gerald Firth have noted that the study of supervision lacks focus largely due to the "lack of research and continuing disagreement on the definition and purposes of supervision."49 To define supervision as merely "the improvement of instruction" does little to focus attention on critical dimensions of instructional supervision. Moreover, there is little, if any, consensus about the definitions that do abound.50 Consequently, a lack of clarity as to even the duties and responsibilities of supervisors has been

46. Herbert M. Kliebard, "Constructing a History of the American Curriculum," in Handbook of Research on Curriculum, ed. Philip W. Jackson (New York: Macmillan, 1992), p. 161.
47. See, for example, Herbert M. Kliebard, "The Curriculum Field in Retrospect," in ed. Paul W. F. Witt, Technology and the Curriculum (New York: Teachers College Press, 1968). Again, the point in this context is not to assert that curriculum history has been fully accepted, for this would be inaccurate. The point being that compared to curriculum the situation in supervision is bleak.
48. Francis S. Bolin, "On Defining Supervision," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 2 (Summer 1987): 368-380; Robert D. Krey and Peter J. Burke, A Design for Instructional Supervision (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1989).
49. Robert J. Alfonso and Gerald R. Firth, "Supervision: Needed Research," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 5 (Winter 1990): 181-188.
50. Robert D. Krey and Peter J. Burke, A Design for Instructional Supervision (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1989).

prevalent since around 1920. The fact that historical scholarship has not been taken seriously is understandable, albeit regrettable, given the absence of focus and lack of consensus as to what supervisors do. Is it possible to study a field historically that has difficulty in even defining its parameters and, at the same time, is unclear about its role in schools?

Another reason why historical analysis is not often attended to relates to a fundamental difficulty that, until rather recently, characterized education as a whole. The model of social research, the scientific method, and the logic which underpins it, positivism, has dominated educational and administrative theory. For supervisors, both practitioners and theorists, ontological and epistemological assumptions have shaped the kind of methodology accepted in the field. The predominance of this social science perspective has only recently undergone criticism in light of the emergence of qualitative, including ethnographic and biographical, analyses. The traditions of positivism and the scientific method in educational research have precluded scholars of supervision, in this case, from examining the historical context out of which they operate because immediate, practical results are preferred.51

Ahistoricism in supervision is compounded by a more fundamental problem. It is not only that supervision history has been marginalized, but supervision as a field of study has not received adequate attention. Ben Harris decried the lack of research in supervision. Even Educational Leadership, explained Harris, "rare among nationally circulated periodicals in

---

51. See, for example, Graham Hitchcock and David Hughes, Research and the Teacher: A Qualitative Introduction to School-based Research (London: Routledge, 1991).

being devoted primarily to supervision and curriculum development . . . publishes few articles *per se* and few in supervision research."52

Problems in supervision were articulated by Goldhammer twenty five years ago in a scathing critique of school supervision:

> The problem is, more seriously, an internal one: that in the absence of some cogent framework of educational values and of powerful theoretical systems, operational models, extensive bodies of case material to consult, rigorous programs of professional training, and a broad literature of empirical research, supervision has neither a fundamental substantive content nor a consciously determined and universally recognized process - both its stuff and its methods tend to be random, residual, frequently archaic, and eclectic in the worst sense.53

The National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE) has devoted only one work to supervision that was published over eighty years ago.54 The inattention to supervision has been echoed even by ASCD presidents. For example, Muriel Crosby, president 1968-69, in an address at an ASCD annual conference in 1969, charged that supervisors "are being sold short by lack of effective leadership" [within ASCD].55 Recently, Bolin and

---

52. Ben M. Harris, "Need for Research on Instructional Supervision," in Supervision: Emerging Profession, ed. Robert R. Leeper (Washington, D. C.: ASCD, 1964).
53. Robert Goldhammer, Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Incorporated, 1969).
54. Franklin Bobbitt, "Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problems of City School Systems" in the twelfth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, The Supervision of City Schools (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1913).
55. Muriel Crosby, "The New Supervisor: Caring, Coping, Becoming," address before the 24th ASCD annual conference, Chicago, 16-20, March 1969, Robert R. Leeper, ed., Changing Supervision for Changing Times, (Washington, D. C.: ASCD Yearbook, 1969), p. 62. Nearly ten years later Gerald R. Firth, ASCD president 1986-87, pledged that "Supervision will

Panaritis commented on the lack of attention paid to supervision even by the ASCD. "Between 1944 and 1981, ASCD had published more than forty yearbooks; but only four of these were devoted to supervision."56 Since 1981, only two other yearbooks have been devoted to supervision.57 Even the yearbook dealing with improving teaching, does not even mention supervision.58 I might further add a note of interest that *four* recent, influential reference works do not refer to the work of supervisors or the function of supervision.59

Also, supervision, historically, has had an identity crisis. The fields of administration and curriculum seem to have subsumed the function of supervision. Supervision as a field of study in its own right has not been recognized.60 Alfonso and Firth stated quite emphatically: "supervision is subservient to the interests of either educational administration or

---

receive emphasis during my presidency . . ." He also stated that the lack of attention to supervision was "reflected in a low percentage of supervisor members and supervision activities - programs, publications, and projects." Gerald R. Firth, "ASCD and Supervision: The Later Years," in ASCD in Retrospect, ed. William Van Til (Washington, D. C.: ASCD, 1986), p. 81.

56. Francis Bolin and Philip Panaritis, "Searching for a Common Purpose: A Perspective on the History of Supervision," in Supervision in Transition: 1992 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, ed. Carl D. Glickman (Alexandria, VA: ASCD), p. 40.

57. Thomas J. Sergiovanni, ed., Supervision of Teaching (Washington, D. C.: ASCD Yearbook, 1982) and Carl D. Glickman, ed., Supervision in Transition (Washington, D. C.: ASCD Yearbook, 1992).

58. Karen K. Zumalt, ed., Improving Teaching (Washington, D. C.: ASCD Yearbook, 1986).

59. Marvin C. Alkin, Encyclopedia of Educational Research (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1992); Philip W. Jackson, ed., Handbook of Research on Curriculum (New York Macmillan Publishing Company, 1991); W. R. Houston, ed., Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1990); Norman J. Boyan, ed., Handbook of Research on Educational Administration (New York: Longman, 1988).

60. Jeffrey Glanz, Bureaucracy and Professionalism: The Evolution of Public School Supervision (New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1991).

curriculum."61 Note Goldhammer's lucid comments: "by comparison to teaching, administration, and, more recently, school counseling, useful literature on supervision is disappointingly sparse. Its authors and students have constituted an energetic, but dismayingly small, minority in the educational community."62

Curiously, although supervision's heritage is rooted in school administration, few, if any, textbooks on administration address issues specific to supervision. Theories and processes of administration are espoused but rare mention of supervisory theory and practice is made.63 Attesting to the subordination of supervision is the fact that many college and university departments of education fail to even mention supervision in their titles. For example, the Department of Educational Studies, the Department of Curriculum and Teaching, the Department of Instruction, Curriculum, and Administration are just a few examples. Alfonso and Firth concurred: "instructional supervision has not been properly recognized in higher education. . . . With the exception of a handful of universities, supervision is not taken seriously in most graduate programs in education."64 Over twenty years earlier, Goldhammer proclaimed that "supervisor education has never occupied an important place in America's

---

61. Robert J. Alfonso and Gerald R. Firth, "Supervision: Needed Research," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 5 (Winter 1990): 181-188.
62. Robert Goldhammer, Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Incorporated, 1969).
63. See, for example, Norman J. Boyan, ed., Handbook of Research on Educational Administration (New York: Longman, 1988) and Roald F. Campbell, Thomas Fleming, L. Jackson Newell and John W. Bennion, A History of Thought And Practice in Educational Administration (New York: Teachers College Press, 1987).
64. Robert J. Alfonso and Gerald R. Firth, "Supervision: Needed Research," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 5 (Winter 1990): 181-188.

colleges and graduate schools of education, nor has supervision of instruction ever emerged as a systematic professional discipline."65

The unfavorable image of supervision and supervisors has contributed to problems in the field. The fact is that vestiges of the bureaucratic legacy of faultfinding, inspectional supervision remains a serious problem and still attracts much criticism.66 This negative perception of supervision continues to present difficulties in terms of gaining professional legitimacy and acknowledgement.

Despite admirable and capable efforts of COPIS, AERA's special interest group (SIG) on instructional supervision, ASCD's network on supervision, the Journal of Curriculum and Supervision published by ASCD, and Robert Anderson's newsletter Pedamorphosis, supervision has not occupied a prominent role in educational theory and practice. Although other scholars in the field have indicated reasons for the "paucity of serious

---

65. Robert Goldhammer, Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Incorporated, 1969), p. viii.
66. See, for example, J. Rooney, "Teacher Evaluation: No More "Super" Vision," Educational Leadership 51 (1993): 43-44; S. Black, "How Teachers are Reshaping Evaluation Procedures," Educational Leadership 51 (1993): 38-42; Robert J. Starratt, "After Supervision," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 8 (1993): 77-86; Cynthia J. Norris, "Supervising with Style," Theory into Practice (1992); Joseph J. Blase and P. C. Kirby, Bringing Out the Best in Teachers: What Effective Principals Do. (California: Corwin Press, 1992); Joseph J. Blase, "Some Negative Effects of Principals' Control-Oriented and Protective Political Behavior, American Educational Research Journal 27 (Winter 1990): 727-753; Jeffrey Glanz, "The Snoopervisor" Learning89, (November/December 1989): 36-37; Larry Cuban, How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1890-1980 (New York: Longman, 1984); Arthur Blumberg, Supervisors and Teachers: A Private Cold War, 2nd. ed. (Berkeley Calif.: McCutchan 1980); William H. Burton and Leo J. Brueckner, Supervision: A Social Process (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955); J. Sherrod, "Six Ways to Avoid a Supervisor," Educational Leadership (Nov. 1952): 132-133; T. Murray and H. M. Bradley, "Teachers Don't Fear Supervision When They Help to Define It" Nation's Schools 46 (August 1950): 37-38; J. R. Shannon, "Teachers' Attitudes Toward Supervision," Educational Method 16 (October 1936): 9-14.

research about supervision in education"67 and certainly a more indepth analysis of this situation is necessary, the fact remains that the field of supervision is moribund, not unlike Huebner's characterization about the curriculum field nearly twenty years ago.68

Taken as a whole, we are simply left with an ambiguous legacy. As Anderson posited " . . . supervision has a rather undistinguished history, a variety of sometimes incompatible definitions, a very low level of popular acceptance, and many perplexing and challenging problems".69 According to Firth, past president of ASCD, emphasis on supervision as a field has been " . . . at best, uneven and, at worst, disjointed."70 Without a well-defined and all-encompassing resuscitation effort that aims for consensus in purpose, definition, and vision for the future, supervision as a role and function will, at best, continue to wallow in mediocrity, remain subservient to the interests of administration, curriculum, and teaching, and in a worse case scenario simply become inconsequential in the educational enterprise.

Constructing a history

---

67. Robert J. Alfonso and Gerald R. Firth, "Supervision: Needed Research," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 5 (Winter 1990): 181-188; Jack Frymier, "ASCD and Research,: in ASCD in Retrospect, ed. William Van Til (Washington, D. C.: ASCD, 1986).
68. Dwayne E. Huebner, "The Moribund Curriculum Field: Its Wake and Our Work," Curriculum Inquiry 6: (1976).
69. Robert H. Anderson, "Creating a Future for Supervision," in Supervision of Teaching, ed. Thomas J. Sergiovanni (Washington, D. C.: ASCD Yearbook, 1982), p. 181.
70. Gerald R. Firth, "ASCD and Supervision: The Later Years," in ASCD in Retrospect, ed. William Van Til (Washington, D. C.: ASCD, 1986), p. 81.

Recently, over a six month period, the Journal of Curriculum and Supervision received eighty-two manuscripts for possible publication.71 Only two of these manuscripts were historical inquiries, neither specifically relating to supervision. Cognizant of this situation, researchers must be encouraged to engage in serious historical study of supervision because there is much to learn. In order to revitalize historical study of supervision, significant avenues should be considered. In this last section, I will address the questions: What research remains to be done? and what sorts of sources might be available and useful? The recommendations offered are brief and not meant to be comprehensive, but simply to get us moving towards constructing a history of supervision.

The gaps in our knowledge of public school supervision are vast. First, we need to know more about how supervision was conducted in various cities throughout the country. For example, were there supervisors in Portland, Oregon, Denver Colorado, and Boston Massachusetts? If so, who were these people and what duties did they perform? How was supervision, in general, conducted in these school systems between 1900 and 1920? We need to gather such data about supervisory practice from all over the nation. We need accounts of supervisors "practicing in school systems or negotiating career ladders."72 We need accounts of practicing supervisors like Gladys Potter, Prudence Bostwick, Chester Babcock, Muriel Crosby, Glenys G. Unruh, Elizabeth S. Randolph, Donald R. Frost, Benjamin P. Ebensole, and Lucille G. Jordan, among other noteworthy practitioners. The professional contributions of these past presidents of ASCD are little if

71. Written communique to editorial board members of the Journal of Supervision and Curriculum Development, ed. O. L. Davis, Jr., (October 1993).
72. Robert Lowe, "Review of Bureaucracy and Professionalism," History of Education Quarterly 32 (Fall 1992), p. 397.

any acknowledged through historical portrayal and analysis. We need studies not unlike Larry Cuban's extraordinary account in How Teachers Taught in which he drew on a wide variety of sources including, among others, photographs, diaries, state, city, and district reports, published books, articles and addresses, unpublished monographs, and oral histories.73

Second, we need educational biographies of well known people (former school superintendents, researchers, and professors of supervision), such as William H. Payne, John D. Philbrick, Andrew S. Draper, William T. Harris, Joseph M. Rice, Emerson E. White, Franklin Bobbitt, Alvin S. Barr, William H. Burton, Harold Spears, Charles H. Judd, Ruth Cunningham, Helen Heffernan, Hollis Caswell, James F. Hosic, Kimball Wiles, and Florence H. Stratemeyer, to mention only a few. We also would benefit enormously from historical portrayals of the professional contributions of more current prominent educators such as Alice Miel, Robert L. Leeper, William M. Alexander, J. Galen Saylor, William Van Til, Arthur Blumberg, Thomas J. Sergiovanni, and many others.74 Furthermore, a neglected area of research has been historical treatments of the practical supervisory work of individual supervisors as well as those concerned with supervision in schools throughout the United States and in other countries.75

---

73. Larry Cuban, How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1890-1980 (New York: Longman, 1984).
74. I realize that by mentioning only a few prominent educators concerned with school supervision I necessarily omit the contributions of many others. The list is tentative and only meant to serve as an example.
75. See, for example, O. L. Davis, Jr., "Historical Inquiry: Telling Real Stories," in Edmund C. Short, ed., Forms of Curriculum Inquiry (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991): 77-87; O. L. Davis, Jr., "To think and To Teach with Fresh Insights: The Inspectorial Work of J. C. Hill In East London Schools, 1931-1953," Paper presented at the Conference of the International Study Association for Teacher Thinking, August 1993.

Third, the story of the merger between the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction and the Society for Curriculum Study that eventually became ASCD has not been fully told.76 For example, an indepth investigation of the strong opposition to the merger by influential people like Helen Heffernan has not been undertaken. What was the nature of this opposition, what arguments were put forth, how extensive was the opposition, and why did the merger, in fact, take place? Furthermore, as a result of the merger, what were the consequences for supervision as a field of endeavor?77

Fourth, various aspects of school supervision warrant further investigation. Some topics include: the origins and early development of public and private school supervision, supervisory practice in Europe, in Colonial America, during the post-Colonial era, the origins and duties of special supervisors, general supervisors, principals, assistant principals, and assistant superintendents, scientific supervision, teachers' reactions to supervisors, rating procedures used by supervisors, supervision in the social efficiency era, and the relationship between supervision and curriculum, and supervision and administration. Additionally, we need to know more about

76. See, for example, Galen Saylor, "The Founding of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development," (1976), mimeographed; O.L. Davis, Jr., "Symbol of a Shift from Status to Function: Formation of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development," Educational Leadership 35 (May 1978): 609-614; William Van Til, ed., ASCD in Retrospect (Washington, D. C.: ASCD, 1986); Jeffrey Glanz, "Curriculum Development and Supervision: Antecedents for Collaboration and Future Possibilities" Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 7 (Spring 1992): 226-244.

77. Interestingly, curriculum scholars have indicated that curriculum as a field of study did not fair very well as a result of the merger. "Our own simple analysis of the new journal indicates that curriculum as a field of endeavor suffered greatly because of the merger." Murray R. Nelson and H. Wells Singleton, "The Merger of Curriculum Journal and Educational Method: Effects of the Curriculum Field," Paper presented at the Society for the Study of Curriculum History, April 1980.

the persistence of the bureaucratic form of school organization. Bureaucracy, in varying degrees, has characterized the American public school system from the 1840s to the present. Firth & Eiken stated that "the delivery of supervision to schools is influenced by the type of bureaucratic structure in which such services must operate."78 We need to know more about how supervision is carried out in different schools varying in degree of bureaucratization. We also need to know how different generations of educators dealt with this bureaucratic phenomenon, what alternatives, if any, were available, and why certain people under different circumstances were able to circumvent the bureaucracy.

Fifth, our knowledge of supervision as a function would be greatly enhanced by examining supervision in various institutional settings, such as private, laboratory, and military post schools.

Additionally, the number of sources into supervisory practice has not been fully tapped. O. L. Davis, Jr. argued that curriculum "needs to collect abundant sources available for study . . . We need everything."79 The time has come to accord equal attention to supervision. We need to find and collect relevant primary sources which might include: diaries of school supervisors, oral histories, surveys, letters, artifacts, rating forms, records of classroom observations, logs, personal files, other kinds of personal correspondence and, of course, other public documents. We need photographs which show supervisors at work. We need to gather a host of

78. Gerald R. Firth and Keith P. Eiken, "Impact of the Schools' Bureaucratic Structure on Supervision," in Supervision of Teaching, ed. Thomas J. Sergiovanni (Washington, D. C.: ASCD Yearbook, 1982), p. 169.
79. O.L. Davis, Jr., "Epilogue: Invitation to Curriculum History," in Perspectives on Curriculum Development 1776-1976, ed. O. L. Davis, Jr. (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1976), pp. 257-259.

secondary sources that include published and unpublished works. Much of the potential data on supervision is fragmented and exists in various sources and in many different locations. Hence, a central agency or locale would facilitate further historical exploration of supervision and serve as repository of vital information about supervision.80

Since the completion of a doctoral study at Teachers College, Columbia University in 1977, not a single dissertation solely devoted to examining school supervision historically has been undertaken.81 There are only a handful of historical accounts of supervision. We need more to help us understand our heritage and better focus our efforts for the future. We need to devote significant time at upcoming conventions of, for example, the ASCD, AERA, and History of Education Society annual meetings for historical inquiry into supervision. Perhaps, a Society for the Study of Supervision History might be in order, not unlike our curriculum counterpart. I would also like to make a formal invitation to students and professors to undertake further study of the history of supervision. Doctoral and even masters degree students might be encouraged to undertake historical investigations. Perhaps, including more historical perspectives of

---

80. I am aware of the fact that Robert H. Anderson has attempted to collect sources at the University of South Florida in the Pedamorphosis Leadership Library. This library, however, has a "shortage of materials published prior to 1977." Additional efforts must be made to expand the contents of this library, especially related to works involving school supervision. See Wingspan 7 (August 1991): 2, a journal published by Pedamorphosis, Inc. devoted to works related to research and practice of educational leadership.

81. Jeffrey Glanz, "Bureaucracy and Professionalism: An Historical Interpretation of Public School Supervision in the United States, 1875-1937" (doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1977). There have been selected dissertations, however, which have taken an historically-oriented approach. See, for example, John H. Fitzgerald, "Management Practices: A Case Study of District Level Supervisors and Directors of Curriculum and Instruction in One School District," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of South Florida, 1991).

supervision in graduate courses may be in order. A special request to scholars like Tyack, Katz, Karier, Davis, Jr., Ravitch, Urban, Condliffe Lagemann, Clifford, Warren, Anderson, Neville, Garman, Glickman, Bolin, and Cuban, to cite just a few, can be made to engage in this provocative historical venture.

For individuals concerned with historical exploration of supervision, a number of relevant sources might be helpful. The sources that follow are illustrative and are not meant to be comprehensive or complete.

There are numerous journals, manuscripts, proceedings, and other recorded sources that the researcher should consult. Some of the periodicals and journals that should be consulted in studying school supervision are, for example, the American Institute of Instruction (1831-1908), American School Board Journal (1891-1949), American Teacher (1912-1949), Curriculum Journal (1931-1943), Education (1880-1948), Educational Method (1921-1943), Journal of Education (1875-1949), and School Review (1893-1949). While these periodicals are rich sources of school supervision, many other journals should be consulted as well, such as the Atlantic Monthly, Chicago School Journal, High School Quarterly, Nation's Schools, and Secondary Education, among others.

A number of influential associations published a variety of yearbooks which also provide essential information. The researcher should consult the publications by the following associations: the Department of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals (Yearbooks 1-4, 1917-20), National Conference on Educational Method, The National Herbart Society for the Scientific Study of Teaching, The National Society for the Study of Education, and the Society for Curriculum Study.

Several other sources can prove useful in the study of public school supervision. Some of these sources include state and local documents; proceedings, manuals, and journals of boards of education; state education department reports; Annual Reports of the U.S. Commissioner of Education; Annual Reports of Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents, Principals, and Supervisors; U.S. Bureau of Education, Circulars of Information; and other miscellaneous public school reports across the country. Additionally, while archival and other types of correspondence need to be explored pertaining to public school supervision, the following materials may serve as a worthwhile beginning: The Nicholas Murray Butler Papers in the Manuscript Room at Butler Library, Columbia University, and the Teachers College Library Archives (New York City school system). Many other documents and oral histories kept at various institutions and universities should be explored.

In conclusion, insufficient investigation into supervision history has thwarted, in part, the efforts of our field to gain the professional recognition it certainly deserves. Instructional supervision, as an ongoing and dynamic process, remains an indispensable function serving the highest ideals of schooling in our democracy. Despite the musings of some theorists that supervision may no longer be necessary,82 educational supervision which, at its best, aims to inspire and encourage teachers to do their best is as much needed today as it was back in 1875 when William H. Payne published the first textbook on school supervision.83 While methods in

82. Robert J. Starratt, "After Supervision," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 8 (Fall 1992): 77-86; Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Moral Authority and the Regeneration of Supervision," in Supervision in Transition ed. Carl D. Glickman, (Washington, D. C.: ASCD Yearbook, 1992).
83. William H. Payne, Chapters on School Supervision (New York: Wilson, Hinkle, 1875).

supervision have undergone numerous transformations since the days of Payne, the history of the field remains regrettably unexplored. In this brief article, I have attempted to address the importance of a supervision history and why efforts to construct a history have been meager. Avenues for future research have been explored. Although much work remains to be done, it is hoped that this article, and the work of others, will stimulate dialogue and action. The invitation is extended. Welcome and good luck!